arXiv:1512.02670v1 [math.CO] 8 Dec 2015

ON DISCRETE VALUES OF BILINEAR FORMS

ALEX IOSEVICH, OLIVER ROCHE-NEWTON, MISHA RUDNEV

Abstract. This paper is an erratum to our paper, entitled *On an application of Guth-Katz theorem.* Math. Res. Lett. **18** (2011), no. 4, 691–697, [8].

Let F be the real or complex field and ω a non-degenerate skew-symmetric bilinear form in the plane F^2. We prove that for finite a point set $P \subset F^2 \setminus \{0\}$, the set $T_\omega(P)$ of nonzero values of ω in $P \times P$, if nonempty, has cardinality $\Omega(N^{9/13})$.

A presumably near-sharp estimate $\Omega(N/\log N)$ was claimed in [8] over the reals for a symmetric or skew-symmetric form ω. However, the set-up for the proof was flawed. We discuss why we believe that justifying the claim of [8] in full strength is a major open problem.

In the special case when $P = A \times A$, where A is a set of at least two reals, we establish the following sum-product type estimates:

$$|AA + AA| = \Omega\left(|A|^{19/12}\right),$$

and

$$|AA - AA| = \Omega\left(\frac{|A|^{26/17}}{\log^{2/17}|A|}\right).$$

1. Introduction

Let F be the real or complex field and let ω be a non-degenerate symmetric or skew-symmetric bilinear form on F^2. Consider an N-element point set $P \subset F^2 \setminus \{0\}$, that is $|P| = N$. The question we ask is, what is the minimum cardinality of

$$T_\omega(P) = \{\omega(q, q') : q, q' \in P\} \setminus \{0\}. \tag{1}$$

One exceptional case is that the set $T_\omega(P)$ can be empty, given that the form ω is skew-symmetric and P is supported on a single line through the origin. But what if one excludes this special case? The following conjecture appears to be a central open question of discrete projective plane geometry.

Conjecture 1. $|T_\omega(P)| = \Omega^*(N)$, *that is possibly modulo logarithmic terms in* N.

In fact, we have no evidence that the logarithmic factors should be there. After establishing partial results towards the resolution of this problem in the main body of the paper, additional discussion of the conjecture is presented in the appendix.

Throughout the rest of the paper the standard symbols O, Ω, and Θ are used to imply absolute constants in upper and lower bounds, respectively, as well as the symbols $\ll$, $\gg$, and $\approx$. C and c stand for positive absolute constants, which may change from line to line.

All the sets we are dealing with are assumed to be finite and have more than one element. For such a set $A \subset F \setminus \{0\}$ we use the standard notations for its sum set

$$A + A = \{a_1 + a_2 : a_1, a_2 \in A\},$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 68R05,11B75.

the difference set $A-A$, the product set AA, the ratio set $A:A$, proceeding in the same vein with notations for sets arising from other algebraic operations on finite sets.

We write $\mathsf{E}(A,B)$ for the additive energy of two sets $A,B\subseteq F$, that is

$$\mathsf{E}(A,B)=|\{a_1+b_1=a_2+b_2\ :\ a_1,a_2\in A,\ b_1,b_2\in B\}|,$$

and just $\mathsf{E}(A)$ instead of $\mathsf{E}(A,A)$.

Define $\mathsf{E}(P)$ as the number of quadruples (q,q',r,r') satisfying the equation:

$$\omega(q,q')=\omega(r,r')\neq 0,\qquad q,\dots,r'\in P. \tag{2}$$

The bound $O(N^3\log N)$ on the number $\mathsf{E}(P)$, over the reals, was claimed in [8] in the case when ω is the standard cross-product or the dot product. Similar to the construction in the celebrated paper of Guth-Katz [5], which settled the plane Erdős distinct distances problem, it was claimed that a pair $(q,r)\in F^4$ defines a line in the group $SL_2(F)$, and solutions of (2) are in one-to-one correspondence with lines' pairwise intersections. Unfortunately, we discovered an error in the set-up.

Technically, the error came down to ignoring the presence of possible degeneracy, inherent in the problem. If a quadruple (q,q',r,r') satisfies equation (2), then so does $(\lambda q,q',\lambda r,r')$ for any nonzero $\lambda\in F$. This is clearly not the case if one deals with the corresponding equation

$$\|q-q'\|=\|r-r'\|\neq 0,\qquad q,\dots,r'\in P, \tag{3}$$

for equal pairs of distances.

In other words, a line in question in $SL_2(F)$ is defined not by the pair $(q,r)\in F^4$, but $(q:r)\in FP^3$, that is as homogeneous coordinates in the projective three-space. The initial claim in [8] that there arise $\Omega(N^2)$ distinct lines in three dimensions is false. It is to this set of lines the Guth-Katz incidence theorem was applied. Instead, one may have fewer lines with multiplicities, and this makes the estimates coming from the Guth-Katz theorem significantly worse.

For example, in the case of $P=A\times A$, A being a geometric progression, the number of distinct lines in three dimensions would be approximately $N^{3/2}=|A|^3$, rather than N^2, each line appearing with the multiplicity, or weight, of about $|A|$. The application of the Guth-Katz theorem would only yield the estimate $O(N^{13/4}\log N)$ on the number $\mathsf{E}(P)$, even losing a factor of $\log N$ versus what one gets after a single application of the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem, presented in the forthcoming Lemma 8.

If one looks back at equation (6) in [8], it is clear that a line in three dimension it describes is defined not by the quadruple $(a,b,c,d)\in F^4$, but $(a:b:c:d)\in FP^3$.

It was recently shown by the third author in [16], that in the special case when the maximum weight is bounded as $O(1)$, one gets $|T_\omega(P)|\gg N$ over any field F, under a constraint $N\ll p$ in positive characteristic p. We do not address fields of positive characteristic further because we do not have a suitably strong analogue of the forthcoming Theorem 7. The rest of the machinery used can be replaced on the basis of the results in [16]. For more discussion on sum-product type estimates in the positive characteristic case see [15].

Qualitatively, the error in [8] was the false presupposition that the main result was achievable by an adaptation of the proof of the renown Erdős distance problem, which had been beautifully resolved by Guth and Katz [5]. As the title of [8] indicated, it came in the wake of the celebrated work [5], but as we indicated above, the setup does not work in this context. It appears that the Erdős distance problem is very special. For one gets a sharp second moment bound, that is the upper bound for the number of congruent line segments

defined by a Euclidean plane point set P after a single application of an incidence theorem in the projective three-space $\mathbb{R}P^3$ that Guth and Katz succeeded in proving. The theorem had two counterparts, Theorems 2.10 and 2.11 in [5], but we refer to their union as the Guth-Katz theorem.

On the contrary, it was suggested much earlier by Chang [4] that the Erdős-Szemerédi sum-product conjecture, even in its weak form discussed in the appendix, can hardly be expected to get resolved merely by a "black box" application of an incidence theorem, even though the Guth-Katz theorem was not yet available. The fact that the metric second moment estimate for distances in the plane can be converted to a projective one for lines intersecting in three dimensions was discovered by Elekes and Sharir [6] by looking at the $SE_2(F)$ symmetries that take one point of the plane point set to another. It was then shown by the third author and J. M. Selig [17] that what matters is the dimension and the algebraic structure of the equations stating that two line segments in the plane have the same length. For the space of line segments in the plane is four dimensional, just like the Klein quadric, the space of lines in the three-space. So [17] identified the whole family of two-dimensional metric problems, where the set of pairs of congruent in the appropriate sense line segments with endpoints in a N-point set P was put into one-to-one correspondence with a set of intersecting pairs of lines for a family of some N^2 lines in three dimensions.

The Erdős distance problem is one of these problems, some others are analogous statements about spherical and hyperbolic distances. It was shown in [17] how the Guth-Katz theorem applies to these problems directly, bypassing any symmetry group considerations. Previously, the second and third authors [14] followed the Elekes-Sharir and Guth-Katz approach in order to show that N points in the plane determine $\Omega(N/\log N)$ distinct Minkowski distances.

In summary, recent results in [16] and [17], combined with the perspective of this paper establish a general framework for Erdős type problem in the plane over both finite and infinite fields. In this setup, the general problem of lower bounds for the number of distinct values of symmetric or skew-symmetric forms figures as the hardest of the remaining Erdős type problem in the plane, one that is most closely related to the celebrated sum-product conjecture. In this paper we take a small but non-trivial bite out of this problem.

2. Main results

The general result we present as an erratum is the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Let P be a set of N points in $F^2 \setminus \{0\}$, with F being $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. Suppose, the non-degenerate bilinear form ω is skew-symmetric and P is not supported on a single line through the origin. Then*

$$|T_\omega(P)| \gg N^{9/13}.$$

Unfortunately, this result is much weaker than the claim in [8], barely beating the lower bound $\Omega(N^{2/3})$ which comes from the (sharp) bound $O(N^{4/3})$ on the number of appearances of a single nonzero value of ω, given by the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem.

In the special case $P = A \times A$, over the reals, we establish the following.

Theorem 2. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ be finite. Then*

$$|AA + AA| \gg |A|^{5/4}|A : A|^{1/3}. \tag{4}$$

In particular

$$|AA + AA| \gg |A|^{19/12}. \tag{5}$$

This result gives an improvement on the known bound

$$|AA \pm AA| \gg |A||A:A|^{1/2}, \tag{6}$$

which also follows from a simple application of the Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem[1], provided that the ratio set $|A:A|$ is not too large.

To claim Theorem 2 we take advantage of the recent state of the art sum-product estimates. These results rely crucially on the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem. Our proof builds on techniques introduced in the recent elaboration of Solymosi's approach to sum-products (see [21] for the original construction and [10] for its adaptation to the complex case) by Konyagin and Shkredov [11]. Balog [1] was the first to obtain lower bounds for $|AA+AA|$ via this particular geometric approach.

The proof of Theorem 2 does not extend to give a lower bound for $|AA-AA|$. Instead, we utilise the Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem along with the best known results for the sum-product problem for the case when $|A:A|$ is small, to record the following weaker claim.

Theorem 3. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ be finite. Then*

$$|AA-AA| \gg \frac{|A|^{26/17}}{\log^{2/17}|A|}. \tag{7}$$

3. Preliminary results

Our geometric argument uses the Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem. It is indispensable for the sum-product type estimates above. For the purposes of Theorem 1 it can be replaced by a weaker theorem on point-plane incidences in three dimensions, see [16].

Theorem 4. *Let P and L be finite sets of points and lines respectively in the projective plane FP^2, where F is the real or complex field.*[2] *Then*

$$I(P,L) := |\{(p,l) \in P \times L : p \in l\}| \ll |P|^{2/3}|L|^{2/3} + |P| + |L|.$$

It is convenient to record the following corollary.

Corollary 5. *For arbitrary finite sets A, B, C and D of real or complex numbers, the number of solutions to the equation*

$$a - b = cd, \qquad (a,b,c,d) \in A \times B \times C \times D, \tag{8}$$

is $O((|A||B||C||D|)^{2/3} + |A||D| + |B||C|)$.

Proof. Let $l_{b,c}$ be the line with equation $y = cx + b$ and let $L = \{l_{b,c} : (b,c) \in B \times C\}$. Then, with $P = D \times A$, note that $I(P,L)$ is equal to the number of solutions to (8). An application of the Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem completes the proof. □

As a generalisation of Corollary 5 let us quote a weighted version of the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem. The set-up is a pair (P,L) comprising a finite set of points and a finite set of lines in the projective plane FP^2, where F is $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. One has a positive real-valued weight function w on $P \cup L$, with the supremum-norms w_P, w_L and L_1-norms W_P, W_L on the sets P, L, respectively. For a pair $(p,l) \in P \times L$ we write δ_{pl} as the characteristic function of the event that the point p is incident to a line l. The number of weighted incidences I_w, defined below, is bounded as follows.

[1] See Exercise 8.3.3. in [24].

[2] The original proof of the Szemerédit-Trotter theorem over the reals appeared in [23]. It was extended to the complex field by Tóth in as early as in 2003, but the proof came out in print only recently, [25]. For the special case of real/complex Cartesian product sets see a very short and elegant argument by Solymosi and Tardos [22].

Theorem 6. *One has*

$$I_w := \sum_{p\in P,\, l\in L} w(p)w(l)\delta_{pl} \ll (w_P w_L)^{1/3}(W_P W_L)^{2/3} + w_P W_L + w_L W_P. \tag{9}$$

The statement follows after an easy weight rearrangement argument, followed by application of the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem, see e.g. [7].

The other component of the geometric argument in the proof of Theorem 1 consists in the following theorem, which deals with distinct cross-ratios, generated by a finite subset of the projective line FP^1. We recall that, for a quadruple of points $a, b, c, d \in FP^1$, their cross-ratio (also in FP^1) is defined as

$$r(a,b,c,d) = \frac{(a-b)(c-d)}{(a-c)(b-d)}.$$

Let $A \subset FP^1$, denote

$$R(A) = \{r(a,b,c,d) : \ a,b,c,d \in A\}$$

Theorem 7. *Let $A \subset FP^1$. Then $|R(A)| = \Omega(|A|^2)$.*

Theorem 7 was proved in real and complex fields in the paper of Solymosi and Tardos [22] and later was re-discovered for reals by Jones [9]. Note that the estimate is unlikely to be sharp: the correct one is probably $\Omega(|A|^3)$, possibly modulo logarithmic terms in $|A|$. One gets $O(|A|^3)$ distinct cross-ratios if A is a geometric progression.

4. Proof of Theorem 1

In two dimensions a nontrivial skew-symmetric form ω is given by the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, up to a multiplier, so we refer to its values further as *areas* and write simply $T(P)$ for the set of its nonzero values, defined by pairs of non-collinear vectors in P.

Let $P_1 \subseteq P$ contain all those points of P, which are supported on lines through the origin with no more than some $w_0 \geq 1$ points and $P_2 = P \setminus P_1$. The parameter w_0 is to be chosen later. Let N_1, N_2 be the number of elements in P_1, P_2, respectively. Let T_1, T_2 stand for $T(P_1), T(P_2)$. We will obtain two different lower bounds for T_1, T_2.

The first of these becomes better for smaller w_0, whilst the second bound improves as w_0 increases. Balancing the two lower bounds leads to the desired result. The first lower bound is the following.

Lemma 8. *Assume that P_1 is not contained in a single line through the origin. Then*

$$|T_1| = \Omega(N_1 w_0^{-1/2}). \tag{10}$$

Proof. The claim follows after an application of Theorem 6. For each point in $p \in P_1$ and each $t \in T$ draw the line $\{q \in F^2 : \omega(p,q) = t\}$. We obtain an arrangement of some weighted set L of lines with the total weight $W_L = |T_1|N_1$ and maximum weight $w_0 < N_1/2$ (or there is nothing to prove). Consider its incidences with the point set P. Applying Theorem 6 with $w_L = w_0$, $w_P = 1$, $W_P = N_1$ we obtain

$$I_w = O(w_0^{1/3} N_1^{4/3} |T_1|^{2/3}).$$

Note that the last two terms in the estimate (9) of Theorem 6 are dominated by the first one, or the bound (10) holds trivially. On the other hand, we have $I_w = \Omega(N_1^2)$, since I_ω is equal to the number of non-collinear through the origin pairs of points in P_1. Estimate (10) follows. □

Our second bound is as follows.

Lemma 9. *Suppose P_2 is supported on at least four distinct lines through the origin. Then*

$$|T_2| = \Omega(N_2^{3/7} w_0^{3/7}). \tag{11}$$

Proof. Consider the following equation

$$t_1 t_2 = t_3 t_4 - t_5 t_6 : \ t_1, \dots, t_6 \in T_2. \tag{12}$$

The following lemma is central for the argument.

Lemma 10. *Equation* (12) *has $\Omega(N_2^2 w_0^2)$ solutions.*

Before proving Lemma 10 let us show how it quickly implies (11), and thus in turn Theorem 1. We apply Corollary 5 (or equivalently one could apply Theorem 6) to get an upper bound for the number of solutions of (12). Indeed, for any set T, the number of solutions to (12) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |\{(t_1, \dots, t_6) \in T^6 : t_1 t_2 = t_3 t_4 - t_5 t_6\}| &\le \sum_{t_3, t_5 \in T} |\{(t_1, t_2, t_4, t_6) \in T^6 : t_1 t_2 = t_3 t_4 - t_5 t_6\}| \\ &\ll |T|^2 |T|^{8/3} = |T|^{14/3}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, Lemma 10 provides the lower bound from for the same quantity. Comparing the two yields (11).

This suffices to wrap up with the proof of Theorem 1. We set $w_0 = N^{8/13}$ and observe that one of N_1, N_2 is at least $N/2$, and if the corresponding assumption that P_1 is not supported on a single line through the origin or P_2 on fewer than four lines through the origin were false, there would be nothing to prove. □

Proof of Lemma 10. Let (a, b, c, d) be a quadruple of points in P_2, lying in four distinct directions from the origin. Denote $t_{ab} = a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1$ the signed area of a triangle Oab, where $a = (a_1, a_2)$, $b = (b_1, b_2)$ and similarly for other pairs of points in the quadruple.

We have the identity

$$t_{ad} t_{cb} = t_{ab} t_{cd} - t_{ac} t_{bd}, \tag{13}$$

thus getting a particular instance of equation (12).

There are many ways to verify (13): one can do it, e.g. by direct calculation using coordinates, trigonometry, or using the cross and scalar product notation from the fact that

$$(a \times d) \cdot (b \times c) = -c \cdot (b \times (a \times d)) = (a \cdot b)(c \cdot d) - (a \cdot c)(b \cdot d),$$

now replace $b = (b_1, b_2)$ by $b^\perp = (-b_2, b_1)$, the same for c.

Consider a quadruple of oriented areas $(t_{ab}, t_{cd}, t_{ac}, t_{bd})$. Let us introduce the equivalence relation $(a, b, c, d) \sim (a', b', c', d')$ if all the corresponding *four* areas $(t_{ab}, t_{cd}, t_{ac}, t_{bd}) = (t_{a'b'}, t_{c'd'}, t_{a'c'}, t_{b'd'})$ are the same. Note that if (a, b, c, d) and (a', b', c', d') come from different equivalence classes, then the solutions they give to (13) are distinct when viewed as solutions to (12).

Clearly, $(a, b, c, d) \sim (a', b', c', d')$ only if $\frac{t_{ab} t_{cd}}{t_{ac} t_{bd}} = \frac{t_{a'b'} t_{c'd'}}{t_{a'c'} t_{b'd'}}$. But the latter quantity is the cross-ratio[3]. That is, if $\delta_a, \dots, \delta_{d'} \in FP^1$ are the directions from the origin, corresponding

[3]The cross-ratio of four directions $(\delta_a, \delta_b, \delta_c, \delta_d)$ from the origin is defined as follows. Take a line l not passing through the origin. Let a, b, c, d points of intersection of the latter line with the lines in the directions $(\delta_a, \delta_b, \delta_c, \delta_d)$, respectively. Viewing l as FP^1, set $r = \frac{(a-b)(c-d)}{(a-c)(b-d)}$. Now observe that r is the ratio of the corresponding triangle areas rooted at the origin and that viewed this way, the points a, b, c, d can move along the corresponding lines in the directions $(\delta_a, \delta_b, \delta_c, \delta_d)$ without changing the value of r. See, e.g. [18].

to the points $a, \dots, d'$, respectively, then $\frac{t_{ab}t_{cd}}{t_{ac}t_{bd}} = r(\delta_a, \delta_b, \delta_c, \delta_d)$, with the same equation holding for a', b', c', d', and thus $r(\delta_a, \delta_b, \delta_c, \delta_d) = r(\delta_{a'}, \delta_{b'}, \delta_{c'}, \delta_{d'})$.

By Theorem 7 there are $\Omega(|D|^2)$ distinct cross-ratios, where D is the set of directions defined by P_2. Besides, fixing a representative $(\delta_a, \delta_b, \delta_c, \delta_d)$ quadruple of directions with a given cross-ratio, choosing any a, b, c, d in P_2 in the given directions yields different solutions of (12). Indeed, the right-hand side of (13) will remain the same only if a, d are dilated by the same factor, while b, c are contracted by the same factor. But this clearly changes the left-hand side.

It remains to show that we can basically assume that $|D| = |P_2|/w_0$, for if we have fewer directions things get better. The easiest way of doing it is using induction in $|D|$. Let $c < 1$ be the universal constant implicit in Theorem 7. Take, say $c' = c/16$. The lemma is trivially true, with the hidden constant c', if $|D| = 4$, for we can certainly assume that no line through the origin supports $\Omega(N_2)$ points.

Now partition P_2 into P_2' and P_2'', where P_2' corresponds to points on lines through the origin, supporting between w_0 and $2w_0$ points, P_2'' being the rest of P_2. Then if P_2'' contains at least half of P_2, we are done by the induction assumption, for P_2 alone will yield at least $c'(|P_2|^2/4)(2w_0)^2$ solutions to (12).

Otherwise P_2' contains at least half of P_2. It determines at least $|P_2|/(4w_0)$ directions. Hence there are at least $c|P_2|^2/(4w_0)^2$ distinct cross-ratios and $c(|P_2|^2 w_0^2)/16 = c'|P_2|^2 w_0^2$ solutions to (12).

□

5. Proof of Theorem 2

Let the finite set of reals A have more than one element. Define

$$d(A) = \min_{C \neq \emptyset} \frac{|AC|^2}{|A||C|}.$$

To prove Theorem 2 we will need the following result, which is [11, Corollary 8].

Lemma 11. *Let A be a finite sets of reals and α_1, α_2 and α_3 non-zero real numbers. Then the number of solutions to the equation*

$$\alpha_1 a_1 + \alpha_2 a_2 + \alpha_3 a_3 = 0,$$

such that $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in A$, is at most

$$C \cdot d^{1/3}(A) \cdot |A|^{5/3},$$

for some absolute constant C.

Lemma 11 is a consequence of the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem, building on the work of Li and Roche-Newton [12] and Schoen and Shkredov [19].

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that A consists of strictly positive real numbers. Following the notation of [11], for a real nonzero λ, define

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda := \{(x, y) \in A \times A : \frac{y}{x} = \lambda\},$$

and its projection onto the horizontal axis,

$$A_\lambda := \{x : (x, y) \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda\}.$$

Note that $|A_\lambda| = |A \cap \lambda A|$ and

$$\sum_\lambda |A_\lambda| = |A|^2. \tag{14}$$

For each $\lambda \in A:A$, we identify an arbitrary element from $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$, which we label $(a_\lambda, \lambda a_\lambda)$. Then, fixing distinct two slopes λ_1 and λ_2 from $A:A$ and following the observation of Balog [1], we note that at least $|A|^2$ distinct elements of $(AA+AA)\times(AA+AA)$ are obtained by summing pairs of vectors from the two lines through origin with slope λ_1 and λ_2. Indeed,

$$A(a_{\lambda_1}, \lambda_1 a_{\lambda_1}) + A(a_{\lambda_2}, \lambda_2 a_{\lambda_2}) \subset (AA+AA)\times(AA+AA),$$

where for $\lambda \in A:A$

$$A(a_\lambda, \lambda a_\lambda) = \{(aa_\lambda, \lambda a a_\lambda) : a \in A\}.$$

Note that these $|A|^2$ vector sums have slope in between λ_1 and λ_2. This is a consequence of the observation of Solymosi [21] that the sum set of m points on one line through the origin and n points on another line through the origin consists of mn points lying in between the two lines. This fact expresses linear independence of two vectors in the two given directions, combined with the fact that multiplication by positive numbers preserves order of reals. Hence the assumption that the points lie inside the positive quadrant of the plane.

Following the strategy of Konyagin and Shkredov [11], we split the family of $|A:A|$ slopes into clusters of M consecutive slopes, where $2 \le M \le |A:A|$ is a parameter to be specified later. The idea is to show that each cluster determines many different elements of $(AA+AA)\times(AA+AA)$. Since the slopes of these elements are in between the maximal and minimal values in that cluster, we can then sum over all clusters without overcounting.

If a cluster contains exactly M lines, then it is called a *full cluster*. Note that there are $\left\lfloor \frac{|A:A|}{M} \right\rfloor \ge \frac{|A:A|}{2M}$ full clusters, since we place exactly M lines in each cluster, with the possible exception of the last cluster which contains at most M lines.

Let U be a full cluster, with shallowest slope λ_{min} and steepest slope λ_{max}. Let $\mu(U)$ denote the number of elements of $(AA+AA)\times(AA+AA)$ which lie in between λ_{min} and λ_{max}. Then, by the inclusion-exclusion principle

$$\mu(U) \ge |A|^2 \binom{M}{2} - \sum_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4 \in U_j : \{\lambda_1,\lambda_2\} \ne \{\lambda_3,\lambda_4\}} \mathsf{E}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4), \tag{15}$$

where

$$\mathsf{E}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4) := |\{[A(a_{\lambda_1}, \lambda_1 a_{\lambda_1}) + A(a_{\lambda_2}, \lambda_2 a_{\lambda_2})] \cap [A(a_{\lambda_3}, \lambda_3 a_{\lambda_3}) + A(a_{\lambda_4}, \lambda_4 a_{\lambda_4})]\}|.$$

The next task is to obtain an upper bound for $\mathsf{E}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4)$ for an arbitrary quadruple $(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4)$ which satisfies the aforementioned conditions.

Suppose that

$$z = (x,y) \in [A(a_{\lambda_1}, \lambda_1 a_{\lambda_1}) + A(a_{\lambda_2}, \lambda_2 a_{\lambda_2})] \cap [A(a_{\lambda_3}, \lambda_3 a_{\lambda_3}) + A(a_{\lambda_4}, \lambda_4 a_{\lambda_4})],$$

that is

$$(x,y) = (aa_{\lambda_1}, a\lambda_1 a_{\lambda_1}) + (ba_{\lambda_2}, b\lambda_2 a_{\lambda_2}) = (ca_{\lambda_3}, c\lambda_3 a_{\lambda_3}) + (da_{\lambda_4}, d\lambda_4 a_{\lambda_4}),$$

for some $a,b,c,d \in A$. Therefore,

$$\begin{array}{rcccc} x & = & aa_{\lambda_1} + ba_{\lambda_2} & = & ca_{\lambda_3} + da_{\lambda_4} \\ y & = & a\lambda_1 a_{\lambda_1} + b\lambda_2 a_{\lambda_2} & = & c\lambda_3 a_{\lambda_3} + d\lambda_4 a_{\lambda_4}. \end{array}$$

It follows from the conditions on the quadruple $(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4)$ that at least one of its members differs from the other three. Without loss of generality $\lambda_4 \ne \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$. Then

$$0 = a\lambda_1 a_{\lambda_1} + b\lambda_2 a_{\lambda_2} - c\lambda_3 a_{\lambda_3} - d\lambda_4 a_{\lambda_4} - \lambda_4(aa_{\lambda_1} + ba_{\lambda_2} - ca_{\lambda_3} - da_{\lambda_4}),$$

and thus

$$0 = aa_{\lambda_1}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_4) + ba_{\lambda_2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_4) + ca_{\lambda_3}(\lambda_4 - \lambda_3). \tag{16}$$

Note that the values $a_{\lambda_1}(\lambda_1-\lambda_4), a_{\lambda_2}(\lambda_2-\lambda_4)$ and $a_{\lambda_3}(\lambda_4-\lambda_3)$ are all non-zero. We have shown that each contribution to $\mathsf{E}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4)$ determines a solution to (16). Furthermore, the solution (a,b,c) to (16) that we obtain via this deduction is unique. That is, if we start out with a different element

$$z \in [A(a_{\lambda_1}, \lambda_1 a_{\lambda_1}) + A(a_{\lambda_2}, \lambda_2 a_{\lambda_2})] \cap [A(a_{\lambda_3}, \lambda_3 a_{\lambda_3}) + A(a_{\lambda_4}, \lambda_4 a_{\lambda_4})],$$

we obtain a different solution to (16). It therefore follows from an application of Lemma 11 that

$$\mathsf{E}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4) \leq C \cdot d^{1/3}(A)|A|^{5/3},$$

where C is an absolute constant. Therefore,

$$\mu(U) \geq \binom{M}{2}|A|^2 - M^4 C d^{1/3}(A)|A|^{5/3} \tag{17}$$

$$\geq \frac{M^2}{4}|A|^2 - M^4 C d^{1/3}(A)|A|^{5/3}. \tag{18}$$

Choosing the integer valued parameter

$$M := \left\lfloor \frac{|A|^{1/6}}{\sqrt{8C}d^{1/6}(A)} \right\rfloor \tag{19}$$

yields

$$\mu(U) \geq \frac{M^2}{8}|A|^2. \tag{20}$$

Recall that, in fact we need $2 \leq M \leq |A:A|$. It is easy to check that the upper bound for M is satisfied. Besides, $M \leq 2$ implies that $d(A) \gg |A|$, in particular $|A:A| \gg |A|^{3/2}$. Then the basic claim (6) results in a stronger statement than Theorem 2 and we are done.

Thus we proceed assuming that $2 \leq M \leq |A:A|$. Summing over the full clusters, of which there are at least $\frac{|A:A|}{2M}$, yields

$$|AA+AA|^2 \geq \frac{|A:A|}{2M}\frac{M^2}{8}|A|^2 \gg \frac{|A:A||A|^{13/6}}{d^{1/6}(A)}. \tag{21}$$

To complete the proof, we need a suitable upper bound for $d(A)$. We simply use the trivial[4] bound $d(A) \leq |A:A|^2/|A|^2$. Combining this inequality with (21) and rearranging, we get

$$|AA+AA| \gg |A:A|^{1/3}|A|^{5/4},$$

which completes the proof of (4). To prove (5), we simply apply the trivial bound $|A:A| \geq |A|$. □

Proof of Theorem 3. It was established in [11, Theorem 11] that

$$|A:A|^6|A-A|^5 \gg \frac{|A|^{14}}{\log^2|A|}. \tag{22}$$

[4]Another approach would be to use non-trivial arguments from [20] to prove the bound $d(A) \ll |AA+AA|^2/|A|^3$, which implies that $|AA+AA| \gg |A|^{8/7}|A:A|^{3/7}$. This result is better than Theorem 2 when $|A:A|$ is large. However, since this does not result in better unconditional bounds for $|AA+AA|$, we do not pursue the details here.

Plugging this into the bound (6) and rearranging, we obtain

$$|AA-AA|^{12} \gg \frac{|A|^{26}}{|A-A|^5 \log^2 |A|}.$$

The claim of Theorem 3 follows by applying the trivial bound $|A-A| \leq |AA-AA|$ and rearranging. □

Appendix

In this section we give two heuristic arguments, showing the relation of Conjecture 1 to other reputable topics in geometric combinatorics and incidence theory.

Conjecture 1 and the Erdős-Szemerédi problem. Let us call the *weak Erdős-Szemerédi conjecture* the statement that for $A \subset F$, the assumption $|AA| = O(|A|^{1+\delta})$ implies that $|A+A| = \Omega(|A|^{2-\epsilon})$ where the small parameters (δ, ϵ) are on a polynomial curve through the origin. The question has been resolved qualitatively in the integer case, and therefore the $F = \mathbb{Q}$ case by Bourgain and Chang [2], the dependence between δ and ϵ not having been made explicit. It is open over the real, complex, and p-adic fields.

Let us show that a slightly stronger statement than Conjecture 1 implies the weak Erdős-Szemerédi conjecture. Namely suppose, we have the second moment bound $O(|P|^3)$ on the number $\mathsf{E}(P)$ of solutions of equation (2).

Then we have, assuming $0 \notin A$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{E}(A) &= |\{(a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4) \in A\times A\times A\times A : \ a_1+a_2 = a_3+a_4\}| \\
&= |A|^{-4}|\{(a_1,\dots,a_8) \in A\times\dots\times A : \ a_1a_5/a_5 + a_2a_6/a_6 = a_3a_7/a_7 + a_4a_8/a_8\}| \\
&\leq |A|^{-4}|\{(p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4,b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4) \in AA\times\dots\times AA\times A^{-1}\times\dots\times A^{-1} : \\
&\qquad p_1b_1+p_2b_2 = p_3b_3+p_4b_4\}| \\
&\ll |AA|^3|A|^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

after applying the assumption for the plane point set $AA \times A^{-1}$.

It follows, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$|A \pm A| \geq \frac{|A|^4}{\mathsf{E}(A)} \gg \frac{|A|^5}{|AA|^3},$$

thus if $|AA| < |A|^{1+\delta}$, then $|A \pm A| \gg |A|^{2-3\delta}$.

Example: on popular values of ω. We conclude this note by revisiting the well-known Erdős construction showing that one can have a plane point set P of $\Theta(N)$ points with $\gg 1$ nonzero values of the form ω repeating $\Omega(N^{4/3})$ times. By the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem a single nonzero value of ω may only have $O(N^{4/3})$ realisations.

Without loss of generality let ω be the standard dot product. The equation $q' \cdot q = 1$ can be viewed as an incidence relation between N points described by vectors $q \in P$ and N lines described by covectors q'. There are well known constructions, similar to the forthcoming one, where the number of incidences is $\Omega(N^{4/3})$.

Let us also show that the pinned version of equation (2)

$$\omega(q,q') = \omega(q,r') \neq 0 : \ q,q',r' \in P \tag{23}$$

may have as many as $\Omega(N^{7/3})$ solutions. Therefore, it is impossible to use it without additional assumptions on P to settle Conjecture 1.

Contrary to this, we do not have evidence that equation (2) can possibly have more than $O(N^3)$ solutions. On the other hand, we cannot prove at the moment an upper bound better

than $O(N^{10/3})$ for the number of solutions of (2). The latter bound follows, e.g., from the $O(N^{4/3})$ bound on the number of realisations of a single nonzero value of ω.

To avoid taking integer parts, take N to be 6th power of an even integer. Let P be the union of the integer grid square $P_1 = [-\sqrt{N}, \dots, \sqrt{N}] \times [-\sqrt{N}, \dots, \sqrt{N}]$ and the constructed below set P_2 of approximately N points, with some $N^{2/3}$ points lying in each of the approximately $N^{1/3}$ directions from the origin of the set of lines L, defined as follows.

Take all the points with co-prime coordinates (a, b) in the sub-square $[-\sqrt[6]{N}, \dots, \sqrt[6]{N}] \times [-\sqrt[6]{N}, \dots, \sqrt[6]{N}]$ and define a family L of $\Theta(N^{1/3})$ lines through the origin by the following equations:

$$bx - ay = 0, \qquad |a|, |b| \le \sqrt[6]{N} : \quad \gcd(a, b) = 1.$$

Clearly, $L = L^{\perp}$. Each line in L supports $\Theta(N^{1/2-1/6=1/3})$ points of P_1.

Now translate L from the origin to every point of the subset $[-\sqrt{N}/2, \dots, \sqrt{N}/2] \times [-\sqrt{N}/2, \dots, \sqrt{N}/2]$ of P_1. Since each line in L supports $\Theta(N^{1/3})$ points of P_1, in the union $\mathcal{L}$ of the translated lines one gets $\Theta(N)$ lines in $\Theta(N^{1/3})$ directions, hence $\Theta(N^{2/3})$ parallel lines in each direction. (Each line in L gets translated $\Theta(N)$ times but two translates of $l \in L$ result in the same line in $\mathcal{L}$ if their difference is in $P_1 \cap l$.) In particular, since $L = L^{\perp}$ for every line in L, there are $\Theta(N^{2/3})$ lines in $\mathcal{L}$, perpendicular to it, each supporting $\Theta(N^{1/3})$ points of P_1.

The equations of lines in $\mathcal{L} \setminus L$ are

$$bx - ay = bi - aj \neq 0, \qquad |a|, |b| \le \sqrt[6]{N} : \quad \gcd(a, b) = 1, \qquad |i|, |j| \le \sqrt{N}/2.$$

By construction, for every (a, b) there are $\Theta(N^{2/3})$ values of the right-hand side above. Also, there are $\Theta(N)$ distinct points in the set

$$P_2 := \left\{ \left(\frac{b}{bi - aj}, \frac{a}{bi - aj} \right) : \, |a|, |b| \le \sqrt[6]{N}, \;\; \gcd(a, b) = 1; \;\; |i|, |j| \le \sqrt{N}/2, \;\; bi - aj \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Besides, the equation $q \cdot q' = 1$, with $q \in P_1$, $q' \in P_2$ has $\Omega(N^{4/3})$ solutions. The same can be said about the equation $q \cdot q' = c$, for at least a $O(1)$ set of values of c, by scaling P_1. So, one has $\Omega(N^{4/3})$ realisations for each of $\gg 1$ distinct dot product values on the set $P = P_1 \cup P_2$ of $\Theta(N)$ points.

Observe that the set P_2 has the property of being the union of sets of $\Theta(N^{2/3})$ points supported on each of the $\Theta(N^{1/3})$ lines in L. In fact, for the purposes of having $\Omega(N^{7/3})$ solutions to equation (23) it suffices to take *any* set P_2 with the above property. Indeed, consider equation (23) with $q \in P_2$ and $q', r' \in P_1$. Each nonzero vector q has $\Theta(N^{2/3})$ lines in $\mathcal{L}$, perpendicular to it, each line supporting approximately $N^{1/3}$ points of P_1.

Thus the number of solutions of equation (23), that is the number of solutions of $q \cdot (q' - r') = 0$ is at least a constant times

$$N \cdot N^{2/3} \cdot (N^{1/3})^2 = N^{7/3}. \tag{24}$$

This example suggests that there is a principal difference between Conjecture 1 – which has been shown to be related to the Erdős-Szemerédi sum-product conjecture – and the Erdős distance problem. For the analogue of (23) set $q = r$ in (3). However, an analogue of the above construction leading to the estimate (24) is impossible, for Pach and Tardos [13] proved the bound $O(N^{2.137})$ for the number of isosceles triangles defined by a point set in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Moreover, the Erdős distance type questions would all follow up to $o(1)$ exponents from the single distance conjecture, claiming that any distance in the Euclidean plane point set repeats only $O(N^{1+o(1)})$ times (see, e.g., the book by Brass, Moser, and Pach [3] for

details). This is also not the case with single nonzero values of ω, whose set appears to be considerably more volatile.

We finish by noticing that an analogue of the construction in this section does not appear to be feasible within a single Cartesian product set $P = A \times A$, where the problem of distinct values of bilinear forms meets the Erdős-Szemerédi conjecture.

6. Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Ernie Croot and Ilya Shkredov for helpful discussions, and for their – as well as other colleagues' – patience while this erratum was being drafted.

References

[1] A. Balog. *A note on sum-product estimates.* Publ. Math. Debrecen **79**, no. 3-4 (2011), 283–289.
[2] J. Bourgain, M-C. Chang. *On the size of k-fold sum and product sets of integers.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. **17** (2004), no. 2, 473–497.
[3] P. Brass, W. O. Moser, J. Pach. *Research Problems in Discrete Geometry.* Springer, 2005.
[4] M-Ch. Chang. *Sum and product of different sets.* Contrib. Discrete Math. **1** (2006), no. 1, 47–56.
[5] L. Guth, N. H. Katz. *On the Erdős distinct distance problem in the plane.* Ann. of Math. (2) **181** (2015), no. 1, 155–190.
[6] G. Elekes, M. Sharir. *Incidences in three dimensions and distinct distances in the plane.* Combin. Probab. Comput. **20** (2011), no. 4, 571–608.
[7] A. Iosevich, S. Konyagin, M. Rudnev, M, V. Ten. *Combinatorial complexity of convex sequences.* Discrete Comput. Geom. **35** (2006), no. 1, 143–158.
[8] A. Iosevich, O. Roche-Newton, M. Rudnev. *On an application of Guth-Katz theorem.* Math. Res. Lett. **18** (2011), no. 4, 691–697.
[9] T.G.F. Jones. *New results for the growth of sets of real numbers.* Discrete Comput. Geom. 54 (2015), no. 4, 759–770.
[10] S.V. Konyagin, M. Rudnev. *On new sum-product type estimates.* SIAM J. Discrete Math. **27** (2013), no. 2, 973–990.
[11] S.V. Konyagin, I. D. Shkredov. *On sum sets of sets, having small product set.* Preprint arXiv:1503.05771v3 [math.CO] 29 Mar 2015.
[12] L. Li and O. Roche-Newton *Convexity and a sum-product type estimate*, Acta Arith **156** (2012), 247-255.
[13] J. Pach, G. Tardos. *Isosceles triangles determined by a planar point set.* Graph theory and discrete geometry (Manila, 2001). Graphs Combin. **18** (2002), no. 4, 769–779.
[14] O. Roche-Newton, M. Rudnev. *On the Minkowski distances and products of sum sets.* Israel J. Math. **209** (2015), no 2, 507–526.
[15] O. Roche-Newton, M. Rudnev, I.D. Shkredov. *New sum-product type estimates over finite fields.* Preprint arXiv:1408.0542 [math.CO] 24 Jul 2015.
[16] M. Rudnev. *On the number of incidences between planes and points in three dimensions.* Preprint arXiv:1407.0426 [math.CO] 4 Dec 2015.
[17] M. Rudnev, J. M. Selig. *On the use of Klein quadric for geometric incidence problems in two dimensions.* Preprint arXiv:1412.2909 [math.CO] 9 Dec 2014.
[18] J. G. Semple, G. T. Kneebone. *Algebraic Projective Geometry.* Oxford University Press 1952.
[19] T. Schoen, I. D. Shkredov. *Higher moments of convolutions.* J. Number Theory **133** (2013), no. 5, 1693–1737.
[20] I. D. Shkredov. *On a question of A. Balog.* Preprint arXiv:1501.07498 [math.CO] 29 Jan 2015.
[21] J. Solymosi. *Bounding multiplicative energy by the sumset.* Adv. Math. **222** (2009), 402–408.
[22] J. Solymosi, G. Tardos. *On the number of k-rich transformations.* Computational geometry (SCG'07), 227–231, ACM, New York, 2007.
[23] E. Szemerédi, W. T. Trotter, Jr. *Extremal problems in discrete geometry.* Combinatorica **3** (1983), no. 3-4, 381–392.
[24] T. Tao, V. Vu. *Additive Combinatorics.* Cambridge University Press 2006.
[25] C.D. Tóth. *The Szemerédi-Trotter theorem in the complex plane.* Combinatorica **35** (2015), no. 1, 95–126.

Alex Iosevich, Department of Mathematics, University of Rochester, Rochester NY 14627, USA
E-mail address: iosevich@math.rochester.edu

Oliver Roche-Newton, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan, Hubei Province, P.R.China 430072
E-mail address: o.rochenewton@gmail.com

Misha Rudnev, Department of Mathematics, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TW, UK
E-mail address: m.rudnev@bristol.ac.uk